

Appl. No. 09/830,430
Amdt. Dated June 9, 2005
Reply to Office action of April 18, 2005
Attorney Docket No. P09801-US1
EUS/JIP/05-1160

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicants have amended claims 1 and 4; no new matter has been added. Claims 1-4 remain pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Examiner Objections - Claims

The Examiner objected to claim 1 because of a certain informality. The Applicants have amended the claim as suggested by the Examiner. The Examiner's reconsideration of the amended claim is respectfully requested.

3.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 4 as being anticipated by Dunn, *et al.* (US6,560,648 B1). Anticipation requires that the disclosure of a single piece of prior art reveal every element, or limitation, of a claimed invention. Furthermore, the limitations that must be met by an anticipatory reference are those set forth in each statement of function in a claims limitations, and such a limitation cannot be met by an element in a reference that performs a different function, even though it may be part of a device embodying the same general overall concept. Dunn fails to teach each limitation of the rejected claims as amended herein, and, therefore, the Applicants traverse the rejection of each of those claims as being anticipated.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter described in the specification at page 7, line 13, *et seq.*, and now recites:

1. A method for improving the quality of a voice call through a router controlled IP network that provides a segment of a telephone circuit for carrying information between at least two subscriber terminals, the method comprising:

reacting to a request for a telephone circuit between said two subscribers by transmitting a voice packet containing an echo request message over the router controlled IP network from a first network node to a second network node;

Appl. No. 09/830,430
Amdt. Dated June 9, 2005
Reply to Office action of April 18, 2005
Attorney Docket No. P09801-US1
EUS/J/P/05-1160

reacting to receipt of the echo request message at the second network node by transmitting a voice packet containing an echo reply message over the router controlled IP network from the second network node to the first network node;

determining the round trip propagation delay for the router controlled IP network segment on the basis of the time which elapses between sending the echo request message from the first node and receiving the echo reply message also at the first node; and,

introducing an echo cancellation mechanism into the IP network, as a function of said round trip propagation delay, prior to establishing said voice call. (emphasis added)

Although Dunn does teach the measurement of network latency, it does not teach introducing an echo cancellation mechanism into an IP network, as a function of round trip propagation delay, prior to establishing a voice call. Accordingly, Dunn fails to anticipate claim 1. Whereas claim 4, as amended, recites limitations analogous to those of claim 1, Dunn also fails to anticipate claim 4.

4.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 2 and 3 as being unpatentable over Dunn in view of Handig (US 5,857,009). As established hereinabove, claim 1 is not anticipated by Dunn. Likewise, Handig fails to cure the deficiencies of Dunn and, thus, claim 1 is not obvious over Dunn in view of Handig. Therefore, claims 2 and 3, which are dependent from claim 1 and includes the limitations thereof, are also not obvious in view of those references.

* * *


Appl. No. 09/830,430
Amdt. Dated June 9, 2005
Reply to Office action of April 18, 2005
Attorney Docket No. P09801-US1
EUS/J/P/05-1160

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants believe all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-4.

The Applicants request a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Roger S. Burleigh
Registration No. 40,542

Date: June 9, 2005

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-5799
roger.burleigh@ericsson.com